arXiv:1205.4160v1 [math.DS] 18 May 2012

A weak comparison principle for reaction-diffusion systems

José Valero

Centro de Investigación Operativa

Universidad Miguel Hernández, Avda. Universidad, s/n. - Elche - 03202
e-mail: jvalero@umh.es

Abstract

In this paper we prove a weak comparison principle for a reaction-diffusion system without uniqueness of solutions. We apply the abstract results to the Lotka-Volterra system with diffusion, a generalized logistic equation and to a model of fractional-order chemical autocatalysis with decay. Morever, in the case of the Lotka-Volterra system a weak maximum principle is given, and a suitable estimate in the space of essentially bounded functions L^{∞} is proved for at least one solution of the problem.

Keywords: comparison of solutions, reaction-diffusion systems, parabolic equations
Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 35B09, 35B50, 35B51, 35K55, 35K57

1 Introduction

Comparison results for parabolic equations and ordinary differential equations are well known in the literature. One of the important applications of such kind of results is the theory of monotone dynamical systems, which leads to a more precise characterization of ω-limit sets and attractors. In the last years several authors have been working in this direction (see, for example, [3], [10], [19], [20], [21] for the deterministic case, and [1], [2], [8], [13] for the stochastic case). In all these papers it is considered the classical situation where the initial-value problem possesses a unique solution.

However, the situation is more complicated when we consider a differential equation for which uniqueness of the Cauchy problem fails (or just it is not known to hold). Let us consider an abstract parabolic problem

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{du}{dt} = A\left(t, u\left(t\right)\right), \ \tau \leq t \leq T, \\ \qquad u\left(\tau\right) = u_{\tau}, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

for which we can prove that for every initial data in the phase space X (with a partial order $\leq$) there exists at least one solution.

If we try to compare solutions of (1) for two ordered initial data $u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$, then we can consider a strong comparison principle and a weak one.

The strong version would imply the existence of a solution u_1 with $u_1(\tau) = u_\tau^1$ such that

$$u_1(t) \leq u_2(t) \text{ for } t \in [\tau, T], \tag{2}$$

for any solution u_2 with $u_2(\tau) = u_\tau^2$, and, viceversa, the existence of a solution u_2 with $u_2(\tau) = u_\tau^2$ such that (2) is satisfied for any solution u_1 with $u_1(\tau) = u_\tau^1$. This kind of result is established in [5] for a delayed ordinary differential equations, defining then a multivalued order-preserving dynamical system.

The weak version of the comparison principle says that if $u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$, then there exist two solutions u_1, u_2 of (1) such that $u_1(\tau) = u_\tau^1$, $u_2(\tau) = u_\tau^2$, and (2) holds.

There is in fact an intermediate version of the comparison principle, which says that if we fix a solution u_1 of (1) with $u_1(\tau) = u_\tau^1$, then there exists a solution u_2 with $u_2(\tau) = u_\tau^2$ such that (2) is satisfied (and viceversa). This is proved in [6] for a differential inclusion generated by a subdifferential map.

In this paper we establish a weak comparison principle for a reaction-diffusion system in which the nonlinear term satisfies suitable dissipative and growth conditions, ensuring existence of solutions but not uniqueness. This principle is applied to several well known models in Physics and Biology. Namely, a weak comparison of solutions is proved for the Lotka-Volterra system, the generalized logistic equation and for a model of fractional-order chemical autocatalysis with decay. Morever, in the case of the Lotka-Volterra system a weak maximum principle is given, and a suitable estimate in the space of essentially bounded functions L^∞ is proved for at least one solution of the problem.

We note that in the papers [11], [12] the existence of a global attractor is proved for such kind of reaction-diffusion systems. In a near future we will apply these results to obtain theorems concerning the structure of the global attractor.

2 Comparison results for reaction-diffusion systems

We shall denote by $|\cdot|$ and $(\cdot,\cdot)$ the norm and scalar product in the space $\mathbb{R}^m$, $m \geq 1$. Let $d > 0$ be an integer and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded open subset with smooth boundary. Consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - a\Delta u + f(t,u) = h(t,x), & (t,x) \in (\tau, T) \times \Omega, \\ u|_{x\in\partial\Omega} = 0, \\ u|_{t=\tau} = u_\tau(x), \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

where $\tau, T \in \mathbb{R}$, $T > \tau$, $x \in \Omega$, $u = \left(u^1(t,x), ..., u^d(t,x)\right)$, $f = \left(f^1, ..., f^d\right)$, a is a real $d \times d$ matrix with a positive symmetric part $\dfrac{a + a^t}{2} \geq \beta I$, $\beta > 0$, $h \in L^2(\tau, T; (L^2(\Omega))^d)$. Moreover, $f = \left(f^1(t,u), ..., f^d(t,u)\right)$ is jointly continuous on $[\tau, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and satisfies the following conditions:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} |f^i(t,u)|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}} \leq C_1(1+\sum_{i=1}^{d} |u^i|^{p_i}), \tag{4}$$

$$(f(t,u),u) \geq \alpha \sum_{i=1}^{d} |u^i|^{p_i} - C_2, \tag{5}$$

where $p_i \geq 2$, $\alpha, C_1, C_2 > 0$.

Let $H = \left(L^2(\Omega)\right)^d$, $V = \left(H_0^1(\Omega)\right)^d$, and let V' be the dual space of V. By $\|\cdot\|$, $\|\cdot\|_V$ we denote the norm in H and V, respectively. For $p = (p_1, ..., p_d)$ we define the spaces

$$L^p(\Omega) = L^{p_1}(\Omega) \times \cdots \times L^{p_d}(\Omega),$$
$$L^p(\tau, T; L^p(\Omega)) = L^{p_1}(\tau, T; L^{p_1}(\Omega)) \times \cdots \times L^{p_d}(\tau, T; L^{p_d}(\Omega)).$$

We take $q = (q_1, ..., q_d)$, where $\frac{1}{p_i} + \frac{1}{q_i} = 1$.

We say that the function $u(\cdot)$ is a weak solution of (3) if $u \in L^p(\tau, T; L^p(\Omega)) \cap L^2(\tau, T; V) \cap C([\tau, T]; H)$, $\dfrac{du}{dt} \in L^2(\tau, T; V') + L^q(\tau, T; L^q(\Omega))$, $u(\tau) = u_\tau$, and

$$\int_\tau^T \left\langle \frac{du}{dt}, \xi \right\rangle dt + \int_\tau^T \int_\Omega (\nabla(au), \nabla\xi)\, dxdt + \int_\tau^T \int_\Omega (f(t,u), \xi)\, dxdt = \int_\tau^T \int_\Omega (h, \xi)\, dxdt, \tag{6}$$

for all $\xi \in L^p(\tau, T; L^p(\Omega)) \cap L^2(\tau, T; V)$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes pairing in the space $V' + L^q(\Omega)$, and $(\nabla u, \nabla v) = \sum_{i=1}^d (\nabla u^i, \nabla v^i)$.

Under conditions (4)-(5) it is known [7, p.284] that for any $u_\tau \in H$ there exists at least one weak solution $u = u(t,x)$ of (3), and also that the function $t \mapsto \|u(t)\|^2$ is absolutely continuous on $[\tau, T]$ and $\dfrac{d}{dt}\|u(t)\|^2 = 2\left\langle \dfrac{du}{dt}, u \right\rangle$ for a.a. $t \in (\tau, T)$.

Denote $r = (r_1, ..., r_d)$, $r_i = \max\{1; N(1/q_i - 1/2)\}$. Any weak solution satisfies $\dfrac{du}{dt} \in L^q(\tau, T; H^{-r}(\Omega))$ and

$$L^q(0,T; H^{-r}(\Omega)) = L^{q_1}(0,T; H^{-r_1}(\Omega)) \times \cdots \times L^{q_d}(0,T; H^{-r_d}(\Omega)).$$

If, additionally, we assume that that $f(t,u)$ is continuously differentiable with respect to u for any $t \in [\tau, T]$, $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and

$$(f_u(t,u)w, w) \geq -C_3(t)\,|w|^2, \text{ for all } w, u \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{7}$$

where $C_3(\cdot) \in L^1(\tau, T)$, $C_3(t) \geq 0$, the weak solution of (3) is unique. Here, f_u denotes the jacobian matrix of f.

We consider also the following assumption: there exists $R_0 > 0$ such that

$$f^i(t,u) \geq f^i(t,v), \tag{8}$$

for any $t \in [\tau, T]$ and any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $u^i = v^i$ and $u^j \leq v^j$ if $j \neq i$, and $|u|, |v| \leq R_0$, which means that the systems is cooperative in the ball with radius R_0 centered at 0.

Consider two problems

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - a\Delta u + f_1(t, u) = h_1(t, x), \quad (t, x) \in (\tau, T) \times \Omega, \\ u|_{x\in\partial\Omega} = 0, \\ u|_{t=\tau} = u_\tau(x), \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - a\Delta u + f_2(t, u) = h_2(t, x), \quad (t, x) \in (\tau, T) \times \Omega, \\ u|_{x\in\partial\Omega} = 0, \\ u|_{t=\tau} = u_\tau(x), \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

where f_j are jointly continuous on $[\tau, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Among conditions (4)-(5) and (7)-(8) we shall consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(t, x) &\leq h_2(t, x), \text{ for a.a. } (t, x), \\ f_1^i(t, u) &\geq f_2^i(t, u), \text{ for all } t, u. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Lemma 1 *If f_j satisfy (4)-(5) and (11), then the constants p_i has to be the same for f_1 and f_2.*

Proof. Denote by p_i^j, α^j, C_1^j, C_2^j the constants corresponding to f_j in (4)-(5). By contradiction let, for example, $p_1^2 > p_1^1$. Take the sequence $u_n = (u_n^1, 0, ..., 0)$, where $u_n^1 \to +\infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Then by (4)-(5), (11) and Young's inequality we have

$$\alpha^2 \left|u_n^1\right|^{p_1^2} - C_2^2 \leq (f_2(t, u_n), u_n) \leq (f_1(t, u_n), u_n)$$

$$= f_1^1(t, u_n)\, u_n^1 \leq \left(C_1^1(1 + |u_n^1|^{p_1^1})\right)^{\frac{p_1^1 - 1}{p_1^1}} u_1^n \leq C(1 + |u_n^1|^{p_1^1}).$$

But $p_1^2 > p_1^1$ implies the existence of n such that $\alpha^2 |u_n^1|^{p_1^2} - C_2^2 > C(1 + |u_n^1|^{p_1^1})$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $p_1^2 \leq p_1^1$.

Conversely, let $p_1^2 < p_1^1$. Then we take $u_n = (u_n^1, 0, ..., 0)$ with $u_n^1 \to -\infty$ as $n \to \infty$, so that

$$\alpha^1 \left|u_n^1\right|^{p_1^1} - C_2^1 \leq (f_1(t, u_n), u_n) \leq (f_2(t, u_n), u_n)$$

$$= f_2^1(t, u_n)\, u_n^1 \leq \left(C_1^2(1 + |u_n^1|^{p_1^2})\right)^{\frac{p_1^2 - 1}{p_1^2}} u_1^n \leq C(1 + |u_n^1|^{p_1^2}).$$

As before, we obtain a contradiction, so $p_1^2 = p_1^1$.

Repeating similar arguments for the other p_i^j we obtain that $p_i^1 = p_i^2$ for $i = 1, ..., d$. ■

We recall [11] that under conditions (4)-(5) any solution $u(\cdot)$ of (9) satisfies the inequality

$$\|u(t)\|^2+2\beta\int\limits_s^t \|\nabla u(\tau)\|^2 d\tau+\alpha\sum_{i=1}^d\int\limits_s^t \|u^i(r)\|_{L^{p_i}(\Omega)}^{p_i}dr \leq \|u(s)\|^2+C\int\limits_s^t(\|h_1(r)\|^2+1)dr, \quad (12)$$

for some constant $C>0$. Of course, the same is valid for any solution of (10). From (12), for any $T>\tau$ we obtain

$$\|u(t)\|^2 \leq \|u_\tau\|^2+C\int\limits_\tau^T(\|h_1(r)\|^2+1)dr = K^2(\|u_\tau\|,\tau,T) \text{ for all } \tau\leq t\leq T. \quad (13)$$

We shall denote by $u_1(t)$ the solution of (9) corresponding to the initial data u_τ^1, and by $u_2(t)$ the solution of (10) corresponding to the initial data u_τ^2. Also, we take $u^+=\max\{u,0\}$ for $u\in\mathbb{R}$.

We obtain the following comparison result.

Theorem 2 *Assume that* f_j, h_j *satisfy (4)-(5), (7) and (11). If* $u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$ *and we suppose that* f_2 *satisfies (8) with* $R_0^2 \geq 2\max\{K^2(\|u_\tau^1\|,\tau,T), K^2(\|u_\tau^2\|,\tau,T)\}$*, where* $K(\|u_\tau^j\|,\tau,T)$ *is taken from (13), we have* $u_1(t)\leq u_2(t)$*, for all* $t\in[\tau,T]$.

Remark 3 *The results remains valid if, instead,* f_1 *satisfies (8) with* $R_0^2 \geq K^2(\|u_\tau^1\|,T)$.

Remark 4 *If* f_2 *satisfies (8) for an arbitrary* $R_0>0$ *(that is, in the whole space* $\mathbb{R}^d$*), then the result is true for any initial data* $u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$.

Proof. Let $g_2(t,u)=f_2(t,u)+C_3(t)u$. The function $g_2(t,\cdot)$ satisfies (7) with $C_3\equiv 0$. For any $u_1,u_2\in\mathbb{R}^d$ define $v_2(u_1,u_2)$ by

$$v_2^i=\begin{cases} u_2^i, \text{ if } u_1^i \geq u_2^i, \\ u_1^i, \text{ if } u_1^i < u_2^i. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Note that $u_1-v_2=(u_1-u_2)^+$ and $v_2-u_2=-(u_2-u_1)^+$, so $v_2^i\leq u_2^i$ for all i. For the function $(u_1-u_2)^+$ we can obtain by (11) and the Mean Value Theorem that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left\|(u_1-u_2)^+\right\|^2+a\left\|(u_1-u_2)^+\right\|_V^2 \leq -\int_\Omega \left(f_1(t,u_1)-f_2(t,u_2),(u_1-u_2)^+\right)dx \\
&\leq -\int_\Omega\left(f_2(t,u_1)-f_2(t,v_2),(u_1-u_2)^+\right)dx-\int_\Omega\left(f_2(t,v_2)-f_2(t,u_2),(u_1-u_2)^+\right)dx \\
&= -\int_\Omega\left(g_{2u}(t,v(t,x,u_1,u_2))(u_1-v_2),(u_1-u_2)^+\right)dx+C_3(t)\left\|(u_1-u_2)^+\right\|^2 \\
&\quad -\int_\Omega\left(f_2(t,v_2)-f_2(t,u_2),(u_1-u_2)^+\right)dx
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= -\int_{\Omega}\left(g_{2u}\left(t,v\left(t,x,u_1,u_2\right)\right)\left(u_1-u_2\right)^+,\left(u_1-u_2\right)^+\right)dx + C_3\left(t\right)\left\|\left(u_1-u_2\right)^+\right\|^2 \\
&\quad -\int_{\Omega}\left(f_2\left(t,v_2\right)-f_2\left(t,u_2\right),\left(u_1-u_2\right)^+\right)dx \\
&\leq C_3\left(t\right)\left\|\left(u_1-u_2\right)^+\right\|^2 - \int_{\Omega}\left(f_2\left(t,v_2\right)-f_2\left(t,u_2\right),\left(u_1-u_2\right)^+\right)dx.
\end{aligned}
$$

For all t we have

$$
\left(f_2\left(t,v_2\right)-f_2\left(t,u_2\right),\left(u_1-u_2\right)^+\right) = \sum_{i\in J}\left(f_2^i\left(t,v_2\right)-f_2^i\left(t,u_2\right)\right)\left(u_1^i-u_2^i\right)^+, \tag{15}
$$

where $u_1^i-u_2^i>0$, for $i\in J$, and $u_1^i-u_2^i\leq 0$ if $i\notin J$. For any $i\in J$ we have that $v_2^i=u_2^i$, and then by $v_2\leq u_2$, $\left|v_2\right|^2\leq\left|u_1\right|^2+\left|u_2\right|^2$, (13) and (8) we get

$$
f_2^i\left(t,v_2\right)-f_2^i\left(t,u_2\right)\geq 0.
$$

By Gronwall's lemma we get

$$
\left\|\left(u_1\left(t\right)-u_2\left(t\right)\right)^+\right\|^2 \leq \left\|\left(u_\tau^1-u_\tau^2\right)^+\right\|^2 e^{\int_\tau^t 2C_3(s)ds} = 0.
$$

Thus $\left\|\left(u_1-u_2\right)^+\right\|=0$, which means that $u_1^i\left(x,t\right)-u_2^i\left(x,t\right)\leq 0$, for a.a. $x\in\Omega$, and all $i\in\{1,..,d\}$, $t\in[\tau,T]$. ■

Remark 5 *In the scalar case, that is,* $d=1$, *condition (8) is trivially satisfied.*

When condition (7) fails to be true, we will obtain a weak comparison principle.

Define a sequence of smooth functions $\psi_k:\mathbb{R}_+\to[0,1]$ satisfying

$$
\psi_k\left(s\right)=\begin{cases} 1, \text{ if } 0\leq s\leq k, \\ 0\leq\psi_k\left(s\right)\leq 1, \text{ if } k\leq s\leq k+1, \\ 0, \text{ if } s\geq k+1. \end{cases} \tag{16}
$$

For every $k\geq 1$ we put $f_k^i(t,u)=\psi_k\left(|u|\right)f^i\left(t,u\right)+\left(1-\psi_k\left(|u|\right)\right)g^i\left(u\right)$, where $g^i\left(u\right)=\left|u^i\right|^{p_i-2}u^i$. Then $f_k\in\mathbb{C}([\tau,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$ and for any $A>0$,

$$
\sup_{t\in[\tau,T]}\sup_{|u|\leq A}\left|f_k(t,u)-f(t,u)\right|\to 0,\ as\ k\to\infty.
$$

Let $\rho_\varepsilon:\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}_+$ be a mollifier, that is, $\rho_\epsilon\in\mathbb{C}_0^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}\right)$, *supp* $\rho_\epsilon\subset B_\epsilon=\{x\in\mathbb{R}^d: |x|<\epsilon\}$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho_\epsilon\left(s\right)ds=1$ and $\rho_\epsilon\left(s\right)\geq 0$ for all $s\in\mathbb{R}^d$. We define the functions

$$
f_k^\epsilon(t,u)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho_\epsilon(s)f_k(t,u-s)ds.
$$

Since for any $k \geq 1$ f_k is uniformly continuous on $[0,T] \times [-k-1, k+1]$, there exist $\epsilon_k \in (0,1)$ such that for all u satisfying $|u| \leq k$, and for all s for which $|u - s| < \epsilon_k$ we have

$$\sup_{t \in [\tau,T]} |f_k(t,u) - f_k(t,s)| \leq \frac{1}{k}. \tag{17}$$

We put $f^k(t,u) = f_k^{\epsilon_k}(t,u)$. Then $f^k(t,\cdot) \in \mathbb{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$, for all $t \in [\tau, T], k \geq 1$.

For further arguments we need the following technical result [12, Lemma 2].

Lemma 6 *Let f satisfy (4)-(5). For all $k \geq 1$ the following statements hold:*

$$\sup_{t \in [\tau,T]} \sup_{|u| \leq A} |f^k(t,u) - f(t,u)| \to 0, \text{ as } k \to \infty, \; \forall \; A > 0, \tag{18}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} |f^{ki}(t,u)|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i - 1}} \leq D_1 (1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d} |u^i|^{p_i}), \; \left(f^k(t,u), u\right) \geq \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{d} |u^i|^{p_i} - D_2, \tag{19}$$

$$\left(f_u^k(t,u)w, w\right) \geq -D_3(k)\, |w|^2, \; \forall u, w, \tag{20}$$

where $D_3(k)$ is a non-negative number, and the positive constants D_1, $D_2 \geq C_2$, γ do not depend on k.

Consider first the scalar case.

Theorem 7 *Let $d = 1$. Assume that f_j, h_j satisfy (4)-(5) and (11). If $u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$, there exist two solutions u_1, u_2 (of (9) and (10), respectively) such that $u_1(t) \leq u_2(t)$, for all $t \in [\tau, T]$.*

Proof. For the functions f_j we take the approximations f_j^k (defined in Lemma 6), which satisfy (18)-(20), and consider the problems

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - a\Delta u + f_j^k(t,u) = h_j(t,x), & (t,x) \in (\tau, T) \times \Omega, \\ u|_{x \in \partial\Omega} = 0, \\ u|_{t=\tau} = u_\tau, \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

for $j = 1, 2$. Problem (21) has a unique solution for any initial data $u_\tau \in H$. In view of Lemma 1 the constant p is the same for f^1 and f^2. We note that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{1k}(t,u) &= \psi_k(|u|) f_1(t,u) + (1 - \psi_k(|u|)) |u|^{p-2} u \\ &\geq \psi_k(|u|) f_2(t,u) + (1 - \psi_k(|u|)) |u|^{p-2} u = f_{2k}(t,u). \end{aligned}$$

Then it is clear that $f_1^k(t,u) \geq f_2^k(t,u)$ for every (t,u).

By Theorem 2 we know that as $u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$, we have $u_1^k(t) \leq u_2^k(t)$, for all $t \in [\tau, T]$, for the corresponding solutions of (21).

In view of Lemma 6 one can obtain in a standard way that (12) is satisfied for the solutions of (21) with a constant C not depending on k and replacing α by γ. Hence, the sequences $u_j^k(\cdot)$ are bounded in $L^\infty(\tau,T;H)\cap L^2(\tau,T;V)\cap L^p(\tau,T;L^p(\Omega))$. It follows from (19) that $f_{jk}(\cdot,u_j^k(\cdot))$ are bounded in $L^q(\tau,T;L^q(\Omega))$ and also that $\{\frac{du^k}{dt}(\cdot)\}$ is bounded in $L^q(\tau,T;H^{-r}(\Omega))$, where $r_i=\max\{1;(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p_i})N\}$. By the Compactness Lemma [14] we have that for some functions $u_j=u_j(t,x)$, $j=1,2$:

$$u_j^k\to u_j \text{ weakly star in } L^\infty(\tau,T;H), \tag{22}$$

$$u_j^k\to u_j \text{ in } L^2(\tau,T;H),\ u_j^k(t)\to u_j(t) \text{ in } H \text{ for a.a. } t\in(\tau,T), \tag{23}$$

$$u_j^k(t,x)\to u_j(t,x) \text{ for a.a. } (t,x)\in(\tau,T)\times\Omega, \tag{24}$$

$$u_j^k\to u_j \text{ weakly in } L^2(\tau,T;V), \tag{25}$$

$$\frac{du_j^k}{dt}\to\frac{du_j}{dt} \text{ weakly in } L^q(\tau,T;H^{-r}(\Omega)), \tag{26}$$

$$u_j^k\to u_j \text{ weakly in } L^p(\tau,T;L^p(\Omega)). \tag{27}$$

Also, arguing as in [17, p.3037] we obtain

$$u_j^k(t)\to u_j(t) \text{ weakly in } H \text{ for all } t\in[\tau,T]. \tag{28}$$

Moreover, by (18) and (24) we have $f_{jk}(t,u^k(t,x))\to f_j(t,u(t,x))$ for a.a. $(t,x)\in(\tau,T)\times\Omega$ and then the boundedness of $f_{jk}\left(\cdot,u_j^k(\cdot)\right)$ in $L^q(\tau,T;L^q(\Omega))$ implies that $f_{jk}(\cdot,u_j^k(\cdot))$ converges to $f(\cdot,u(\cdot))$ weakly in $L^q(\tau,T;L^q(\Omega))$ [14]. It follows that $u_1(\cdot)$, $u_2(\cdot)$ are weak solutions of (9) and (10), respectively, with $u_1(\tau)=u_\tau^1$, $u_2(\tau)=u_\tau^2$.

Moreover, one can prove that

$$u_j^k(t)\to u_j(t) \text{ strongly in } H \text{ for all } t\in[\tau,T]. \tag{29}$$

Indeed, we define the functions $J_{jk}(t)=\|u_j^k(t)\|^2-C\int\limits_\tau^t(\|h_j(s)\|^2+1)ds$, $J_j(t)=\|u_j(t)\|^2-C\int\limits_\tau^t(\|h_j(s)\|^2+1)ds$, which are non-increasing in view of (12). Also, from (23) we have $J_{jk}(t)\to J_j(t)$ for a.a. $t\in(\tau,T)$. Then one can prove that $\limsup_{k\to\infty}J_{jk}(t)\le J_j(t)$ for all $t\in[\tau,T]$ (see [11, p.623] for the details). Hence, $\limsup_{k\to\infty}\|u_j^k(t)\|\le\|u_j(t)\|$. Together with (28) this implies (29) (see again [11, p.623] for more details).

Hence, passing to the limit we obtain

$$u_1(t)\le u_2(t)\,,\text{ for all } t\in[\tau,T].$$

■

Further, let us prove the general case for an arbitrary $d\in\mathbb{N}$.

Theorem 8 *Assume that f_j, h_j satisfy (4)-(5) and (11). Also, suppose that either f_1 or f_2 satisfies (8) for an arbitrary $R_0 > 0$. If $u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$, there exist two solutions u_1, u_2 (of (9) and (10), respectively) such that $u_1(t) \leq u_2(t)$, for all $t \in [\tau, T]$.*

Proof. Let f_1 be the function which satisfies (8). We take the approximations f_1^k, f_2^k (defined in Lemma 6), which satisfy (18)-(20). Then we consider problems (21).

In view of Lemma 1 the constants p_i are the same for f^1 and f^2. We note that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{1k}^i(t,u) &= \psi_k(|u|) f_1^i(t,u) + (1-\psi_k(|u|)) \left|u^i\right|^{p_i-2} u^i \\ &\geq \psi_k(|u|) f_2^i(t,u) + (1-\psi_k(|u|)) \left|u^i\right|^{p_i-2} u^i = f_{2k}^i(t,u). \end{aligned}$$

Then it is clear that $f_1^k(t,u) \geq f_2^k(t,u)$ for every (t,u).

Using Lemma 6 it is standard to obtain estimate (13) with a constant C not depending on k. Hence, the solutions $u_j^k(\cdot)$ of (21) satisfy

$$\left\|u_j^k(t)\right\|^2 \leq \|u_\tau^j\|^2 + C \int_\tau^T (\|h_j(r)\|^2 + 1) dr = K^2\left(\|u_\tau^j\|, \tau, T\right).$$

We note that

$$f_{1k}(t,u) = f_1(t,u),$$

if $|u| \leq k$, since in such a case $\psi_k(|u|) = 1$. Hence, if $k^2 \geq 2\max\{K^2(\|u_\tau^1\|, \tau, T), K^2(\|u_\tau^2\|, \tau, T)\}$ the functions f_{1k} satisfy condition (8) with $R_0 = k$. Therefore, for any $t \in [\tau, T]$ and any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $u^i = v^i$ and $u^j \leq v^j$ if $j \neq i$, and $|u|, |v| \leq k-1$, we have

$$f_1^k(t,u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\epsilon_k}(s) f_{1k}(t, u-s) ds \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\epsilon_k}(s) f_{1k}(t, v-s) ds = f_2^k(t,u).$$

Thus, if $(k-1)^2 \geq 2\max\{K^2(\|u_\tau^1\|, T), K^2(\|u_\tau^2\|, T)\}$, the functions f_1^k satisfy condition (8) with $R_0 = k-1$.

By Theorem 2 we know that as $u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$, we have $u_1^k(t) \leq u_2^k(t)$, for all $t \in [\tau, T]$, $k \geq 1 + (2\max\{K^2(\|u_\tau^1\|, T), K^2(\|u_\tau^2\|, T)\})^{\frac{1}{2}}$, for the corresponding solutions of (21).

Repeating the same proof of Theorem 7 we obtain that the sequences u_1^k, u_2^k converge (up to a subsequence) in the sense of (22)-(29) to the solutions u_1, u_2 of problem (9) and (10), respectively. Also, it holds

$$u_1(t) \leq u_2(t), \text{ for all } t \in [\tau, T].$$

■

In the applications we need to generalize this theorem to the case where the constant α can be negative. We shall do this when f_1, f_2 have sublinear growth (that is, $p_i = 2$ for all i). Consider for (3) the following conditions:

$$|f(t,u)| \leq C_1(1+|u|), \tag{30}$$

$$(f(t,u),u) \geq \alpha |u|^2 - C_2, \tag{31}$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and $C_1, C_2 > 0$.

Let f_1, f_2 satisfy (30)-(31) with constants $\alpha^j, C_1^j, C_2^j,\ j = 1,2$. Then if $\min\{\alpha^1, \alpha^2\} \leq 0$, we make in (3) the change of variable $v = e^{-\beta t}u$, where $\beta > -\min\{\alpha^1, \alpha^2\}$. Hence, multiplying (9) and (10) by $e^{-\beta t}$ we have

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial v}{\partial t} - a\Delta v + e^{-\beta t} f_1(t, e^{\beta t} v) + \beta v = e^{-\beta t} h_1(t,x), & (t,x) \in (\tau, T) \times \Omega, \\ v|_{x\in\partial\Omega} = 0, \\ v|_{t=\tau} = e^{-\beta\tau} u_\tau(x), \end{cases} \tag{32}$$

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial v}{\partial t} - a\Delta v + e^{-\beta t} f_2(t, e^{\beta t} v) + \beta v = e^{-\beta t} h_2(t,x), & (t,x) \in (\tau, T) \times \Omega, \\ v|_{x\in\partial\Omega} = 0, \\ v|_{t=\tau} = e^{-\beta\tau} u_\tau(x). \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

It is easy to check that if $v(t)$ is a weak solution of (32), then $u(t) = e^{\beta t} v(t)$ is a weak solution of (9) (and the same is true, of course, for (33) and (10)). Conversely, if $u(t)$ is a weak solution of (9), then $v(t) = e^{-\beta t} u(t)$ is a weak solution of (32).

The functions $\widetilde{f_j}(t,v) = e^{-\beta t} f_j(t, e^{\beta t} v) + \beta v$ satisfy (4)-(5) with $p_i = 2$ for all i. Indeed,

$$|\widetilde{f_j}(t,v)| \leq\leq e^{-\beta t} C_1^j \left(1 + e^{\beta t} |v|\right) + \beta |v| \leq \widetilde{C}_1^j (1 + |v|), \tag{34}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\widetilde{f_j}(t,v), v\right) &\geq e^{-2\beta t} (f_j(t, e^{\beta t} v), e^{\beta t} v) + \beta |v|^2 \\ &\geq \left(\alpha^j + \beta\right) |v|^2 - C_2^j, \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where $\alpha^j + \beta > 0$.

Then we obtain the following.

Theorem 9 *Assume that f_j, h_j satisfy (30)-(31) and (11). Also, suppose that either f_1 or f_2 satisfies (8) for an arbitrary $R_0 > 0$. If $u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$, there exist two solutions u_1, u_2 (of (9) and (10), respectively) such that $u_1(t) \leq u_2(t)$, for all $t \in [\tau, T]$.*

Proof. We consider problems (32) and (33). In view of (34)-(35) $\widetilde{f_j}(t,v) = e^{-\beta t} f_j(t, e^{\beta t} v) + \beta v$ satisfy (4)-(5). Also, defining $\widetilde{h_j}(t,x) = e^{-\beta t} h_j(t,x)$ it is clear that (11) holds. Finally, if, for example, f_1 satisfies (8) for any $R_0 > 0$, then it is obvious that for $\widetilde{f_1}$ is true as well.

Hence, by Theorem 8 there exist two solutions v_1, v_2 (of (32) and (33), respectively), with $v_j(\tau) = e^{-\beta\tau} u_\tau^j$, such that $v_1(t) \leq v_2(t)$, for all $t \in [\tau, T]$. Thus

$$u_1(t) = e^{\beta t} v_1(t) \leq e^{\beta t} v_2(t) = u_2(t), \text{ for } t \in [\tau, T],$$

and u_1, u_2 are solutions (of (9) and (10), respectively, such that $u_j(\tau) = u_\tau^j$. ■

Remark 10 *If f_j satisfy (7), then the solutions u_1, u_2 given in Theorem 9 are unique for the corresponding initial data.*

3 Comparison for positive solutions

Denote $\mathbb{R}_+^d = \left\{u \in \mathbb{R}^d : u^i \geq 0\right\}$. Let us consider the previous results in the case where the solutions have to be positive. Consider now the following conditions:

$$\text{The matrix } a \text{ is diagonal,} \tag{36}$$

$$h^i (t, x) - f^i \left(t, u^1, ..., u^{i-1}, 0, u^{i+1}, ..., u^d\right) \geq 0, \tag{37}$$

for all i, a.e. $(t, x) \in (\tau, T) \times \Omega$ and $u^j \geq 0$ if $j \neq i$. Obviously, in the scalar case these conditions just mean that

$$h(t, x) - f(t, 0) \geq 0, \tag{38}$$

for a.e. $(t, x) \in (\tau, T) \times \Omega$.

It is well known (see [12, Lemma 5] for a detailed proof) that if we assume conditions (4)-(5) only for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$, and also (7) and (36)-(37), then for any $u_\tau \geq 0$ there exists a unique weak solution $u(\cdot)$ of (3). Moreover, $u(\cdot)$ is such that $u(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in [\tau, T]$.

On the other hand, if we assume these conditions except (7), then there exists at least one weak solution $u(\cdot)$ of (3) such that $u(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in [\tau, T]$ [12, Theorem 4]. Moreover, we can prove the following.

Lemma 11 *Assume conditions (4)-(5), (7) only for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$, and also (36)-(37). Then there exists a weak solution $u(\cdot)$ of (3), which is unique in the class of solutions satisfying $u(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in [\tau, T]$.*

Proof. Let u_1, u_2 be two solutions with $u_i(\tau) = u_\tau$, $i = 1, 2$, and such that $u_i(t) \geq 0$ for all t. Denote $w(t) = u_1(t) - u_2(t)$. Then in a standard way by the Mean Value Theorem we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|w(t)\|^2 &\leq -\int_\Omega (f(t, u_1(t, x)) - f(t, u_2(t, x)), w(t, x))\, dx \\ &= -\int_\Omega (f_u(t, v(t, x, u_1, u_2))\, w(t, x), w(t, x))\, dx \\ &\leq C_3(t)\|w(t)\|^2,\end{aligned}$$

where $v(t, x, u_1, u_2) \in L(u_1(t, x), u_2(t, x)) = \{\alpha u_1(t, x) + (1 - \alpha) u_2(t, x) : \alpha \in [0, 1]\}$, so that, $v(t, x, u_1, u_2) \geq 0$. The uniqueness follows from Gronwall's lemma ■

We prove also a result, which is similar to Lemma 1. Denote by p_i^j, α^j, C_1^j, C_2^j the constants corresponding to f_j in (4)-(5). For problems (9) and (10), respectively. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 1 we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 12 *If f_j satisfy (4)-(5) and (11) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_d^+$, then $p_i^1 \geq p_i^2$ for all i.*

Theorem 13 *Let f_j, h_j satisfy (7) and (36)-(37). Assume that f_j, h_j satisfy (4)-(5) and (11) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_d^+$. If $0 \leq u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$ and we suppose that f_2 satisfies (8) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ with $R_0^2 \geq 2\max\{K^2(\|u_\tau^1\|, \tau, T), K^2(\|u_\tau^2\|, \tau, T)\}$, where $K(\|u_\tau^j\|, \tau, T)$ is taken from (13), we have $0 \leq u_1(t) \leq u_2(t)$, for all $t \in [\tau, T]$, where $u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)$ are the solutions corresponding to u_τ^1 and u_τ^2, respectively.*

Proof. As the solutions $u_1(\cdot)$, $u_2(\cdot)$ corresponding to u_τ^1 and u_τ^2 are non-negative, repeating exactly the same steps of the proof of Theorem 2 we obtain the desired result. ■

Remark 14 *The results remains valid if, instead, f_1 satisfies (8) with the same R_0.*

Remark 15 *If f_2 satisfies (8) for an arbitrary $R_0 > 0$ (that is, in the whole space $\mathbb{R}^d$), then the result is true for any initial data $0 \leq u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$.*

We shall need also the following modification of Theorem 13.

Theorem 16 *Let f_j, h_j satisfy (7) and (36)-(37). Assume that f_j, h_j satisfy (4)-(5) and (11) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$. Let $0 \leq u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$. We suppose that f_2 satisfies*

$$f_2^i(t, u) \geq f_2^i(t, v) - \varepsilon, \tag{39}$$

for any $t \in [\tau, T]$ and any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ such that $u^i = v^i$ and $u^j \leq v^j$ if $j \neq i$, and $|u|, |v| \leq R_0$ with $R_0^2 \geq 2\max\{K^2(\|u_\tau^1\|, \tau, T), K^2(\|u_\tau^2\|, \tau, T)\}$, where $K(\|u_\tau^j\|, \tau, T)$ is taken from (13)

Then there exists a constant $C(\tau, T)$ such that

$$\left\|(u_1(t) - u_2(t))^+\right\| \leq C(\tau, T)\,\varepsilon, \text{ for all } t \in [\tau, T],$$

where $u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)$ are the solutions corresponding to u_τ^1 and u_τ^2, respectively.

Proof. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 2 we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left\|(u_1 - u_2)^+\right\|^2 + a\left\|(u_1 - u_2)^+\right\|_V^2 \\
&\leq C_3(t)\left\|(u_1 - u_2)^+\right\|^2 - \int_\Omega \left(f_2(t, v_2) - f_2(t, u_2), (u_1 - u_2)^+\right) dx,
\end{aligned}$$

where v_2 is defined in (14).

Using (15), $v_2 \leq u_2$, $|v_2|^2 \leq |u_1|^2 + |u_2|^2$, (13) and (39) we get

$$f_2^i(t, v_2) - f_2^i(t, u_2) \geq -\varepsilon.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\left\|(u_1 - u_2)^+\right\|^2 &\leq 2C_3(t)\left\|(u_1 - u_2)^+\right\|^2 + 2\varepsilon\int_\Omega \sum_{i \in J}\left(u_1^i - u_2^i\right)^+ dx \\
&\leq (2C_3(t) + 1)\left\|(u_1 - u_2)^+\right\|^2 + K\varepsilon^2,
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $K > 0$. By Gronwall's lemma we get

$$\left\|\left(u_1(t) - u_2(t)\right)^+\right\|^2 \leq \left\|\left(u_\tau^1 - u_\tau^2\right)^+\right\|^2 e^{\int_\tau^t (2C_3(s)+1)ds} + K\varepsilon^2 \int_\tau^t e^{\int_r^t (2C_3(s)+1)ds} dr$$
$$\leq C^2(\tau, T)\,\varepsilon^2.$$

■

Let us consider now the multivalued case. We will obtain first some auxiliary statements.

We shall define suitable approximations. For any $n \geq 1$ we put $f_n^i(t,u) = \psi_n(|u|) f^i(t,u) + (1-\psi_n(|u|)) g^i(t,u)$, where $g^i(t,u) = |u^i|^{p_i-2} u^i + f^i(t,0,...,0)$, and ψ_n was defined in (16). Then $f_n \in \mathbb{C}([\tau,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and for any $A > 0$,

$$\sup_{t\in[\tau,T]} \sup_{|u|\leq A} |f_n(t,u) - f(t,u)| \to 0, \ \textit{as } n \to \infty. \tag{40}$$

We will check first that f_n satisfy conditions (4)-(5) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$, where the constants do not depend on n.

Lemma 17 *Let f satisfy (4)-(5) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$. For all $n \geq 1$ we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^d |f_n^i(t,u)|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}} \leq D_1(1 + \sum_{i=1}^d |u^i|^{p_i}), \ (f_n(t,u), u) \geq \gamma \sum_{i=1}^d |u^i|^{p_i} - D_2, \tag{41}$$

for $u \in \mathbb{R}_d^+$, where the positive constants D_1, D_2, γ do not depend on n.

if $|u| > n+1$, then for any $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$(f_{nu}(t,u)w, w) \geq 0. \tag{42}$$

Moreover, if f, h satisfy (37), then f_n, h also satisfies this condition.

Proof. In view of (4)-(5) we get

$$(f_n(t,u), u) = \psi_n(|u|)(f(t,u), u) + (1-\psi_n(|u|))(g(u), u)$$

$$\geq \psi_n(|u|)\left(\alpha \sum_{i=1}^d |u^i|^{p_i} - C_2\right) + (1-\psi_n(|u|)) \sum_{i=1}^d |u^i|^{p_i} + (1-\psi_n(|u|)) \sum_{i=1}^d f^i(t,0,...,0)\, u^i$$

$$\geq \psi_n(|u|)\,\alpha \sum_{i=1}^d |u^i|^{p_i} - C_2 + (1-\psi_n(|u|)) \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d |u^i|^{p_i} - K_1 (1-\psi_n(|u|)) \sum_{i=1}^d \left|f^i(t,0,...,0)\right|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}}$$

$$\geq \widetilde{\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^d |u^i|^{p_i} - C_2 - K_1 C_1,$$

where $\widetilde{\alpha}=\min\{\frac{1}{2},\alpha\}$, for some constant $K_1>0$. Also,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d}|f_n^i(t,u)|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}}\leq K_2\left(\sum_{i=1}^{d}|f^i(t,u)|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}}+\sum_{i=1}^{d}\left|g^i\left(u\right)\right|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}}\right)$$

$$\leq K_3\left(C_1(1+\sum_{i=1}^{d}|u^i|^{p_i})+\sum_{i=1}^{d}|u^i|^{p_i}+\sum_{i=1}^{d}\left|f^i\left(t,0,...,0\right)\right|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}}\right)$$

$$\leq K_4\left(\sum_{i=1}^{d}|u^i|^{p_i}+1\right),$$

for some constant $K_4>0$. Thus, for $D_1=K_4$, $D_2=C_2+K_1C_1$, $\widetilde{\alpha}=\min\{\frac{1}{2},\alpha\}$ we have (41) for the functions f_n.

Moreover, if $|u|>n+1$, then for any $w\in\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(f_{nu}(t,u)w,w)=(g_u(t,u)w,w)=\sum_{i=1}^{d}\left(p_i-1\right)\left|u^i\right|^{p_i-2}w_i^2\geq 0. \tag{43}$$

Finally, if (37) is satisfied, then

$$\begin{aligned}&h^i\left(t,x\right)-f_n^i\left(t,u\right)\\&=\psi_n\left(|u|\right)\left(h^i\left(t,x\right)-f^i\left(t,u\right)\right)+\left(1-\psi_n\left(|u|\right)\right)\left(h^i\left(t,x\right)-f^i\left(t,0,...,0\right)\right)\geq 0,\end{aligned}$$

for all i, a.e. $(t,x)\in(\tau,T)\times\Omega$ and u such that $u^i=0$ and $u^j\geq 0$ if $j\neq i$. ■

Let $2\leq q_i\leq p_i$, $i=1,...,d$. We define also the following approximations $\widetilde{f}_n^i(t,u)=\psi_n\left(|u|\right)f^i\left(t,u\right)+\left(1-\psi_n\left(|u|\right)\right)\widetilde{g}^i\left(t,u\right)$, where $\widetilde{g}^i\left(t,u\right)=|u^i|^{p_i-2}u^i+|u^i|^{q_i-2}u^i+f^i\left(t,0,...,0\right)$. Then (40) holds. We check that $\widetilde{f}_n$ satisfy conditions (4)-(5) for $u\in\mathbb{R}_+^d$, where the constants do not depend on n.

Lemma 18 *Let f satisfy (4)-(5) for $u\in\mathbb{R}_+^d$. For all $n\geq 1$ we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d}|\widetilde{f}_n^i(t,u)|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}}\leq D_1(1+\sum_{i=1}^{d}|u^i|^{p_i}),\ \left(\widetilde{f}_n(t,u),u\right)\geq\gamma\sum_{i=1}^{d}|u^i|^{p_i}-D_2, \tag{44}$$

for $u\in\mathbb{R}_d^+$, where the positive constants D_1, D_2, γ do not depend on n.

if $|u|>n+1$, then for any $w\in\mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\left(\widetilde{f}_{nu}(t,u)w,w\right)\geq 0. \tag{45}$$

Moreover, if f,h satisfy (37), then $\widetilde{f}_n,h$ also satisfies this condition.

Proof. In view of (41) we have

$$\left(\widetilde{f}_n(t,u),u\right)=\left(f_n(t,u),u\right)+\left(1-\psi_n\left(|u|\right)\right)\sum_{i=1}^{d}\left|u^i\right|^{q_i}\geq\gamma\sum_{i=1}^{d}|u^i|^{p_i}-D_2,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{d}|\widetilde{f}_n^i(t,u)|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}}&\leq K_1\left(\sum_{i=1}^{d}|f_n^i(t,u)|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}}+\sum_{i=1}^{d}|u^i|^{\frac{p_i(q_i-1)}{p_i-1}}\right)\\&\leq K_1\left(D_1(1+\sum_{i=1}^{d}|u^i|^{p_i})+\sum_{i=1}^{d}|u^i|^{q_i}\right)\leq K_2\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{d}|u^i|^{p_i}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $p_i\geq q_i$ implies $\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}\leq\frac{q_i}{q_i-1}$. Finally, (45) and condition (37) are proved in the same way as in Lemma 17. ■

For every $n\geq1$ consider the sequence $f_n^{\varepsilon}(t,u)$ defined by $f_n^{\epsilon}(t,u)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho_\epsilon(s)b_n(t,u-s)ds$, where either $b_n=f_n$ or $b_n=\widetilde{f}_n$, defined before. Since any b_n are uniformly continuous on $[\tau,T]\times[-k-1,k+1]$, for any $k\geq1$, there exist $\epsilon_{k,n}\in(0,1)$ such that for all u satisfying $|u|\leq k$, and for all s for which $|u-s|<\epsilon_{k,n}$ we have

$$\sup_{t\in[\tau,T]}|b_n(t,u)-b_n(t,s)|\leq\frac{1}{k}.$$

We put $f_n^k(t,u)=f_n^{\epsilon_{k,n}}(t,u)$. Then $f_n^k(t,\cdot)\in\mathbb{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$, for all $t\in[\tau,T]$, $k,n\geq1$. Since for any compact subset $A\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ and any n we have $f_n^k\to b_n$ uniformly on $[\tau,T]\times A$, we obtain the existence of a sequence $\delta_{nk}\in(0,1)$ such that $\delta_{nk}\to0$, as $k\to\infty$, and $\left|f_n^{ki}(t,u)-b_n^i(t,u)\right|\leq\delta_{nk}$, for any i, n and any u satisfying $|u|\leq n+2$. We define the function $F_n^k=\left(F_n^{k1},...,F_n^{kd}\right)$ given by

$$F_n^{ki}(t,u)=f_n^{ki}(t,u)-p\delta_{nk},\tag{46}$$

where $p\in\mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 19 *Let f satisfy (4)-(5) for $u\in\mathbb{R}_+^d$. For all $n,k\geq1$ we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d}|F_n^{ki}(t,u)|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}}\leq D_3(1+\sum_{i=1}^{d}|u^i|^{p_i}),\ \left(F_n^k(t,u),u\right)\geq\nu\sum_{i=1}^{d}|u^i|^{p_i}-D_4,\tag{47}$$

for $u\in\mathbb{R}_+^d$, where the positive constants D_3, D_4, ν do not depend neither on n nor k.

Moreover, if f,h satisfy (37), then F_n^k,h also satisfy this condition if $|u|\leq n+2$.

Proof. Since f_n satisfy (41) and $\widetilde{f}_n$ satisfies (44), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} |F_n^{ki}(t,u)|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}} \le R_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} |f_n^{ki}(t,u)|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}} + 1 \right)$$

$$\le R_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} \left(\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\epsilon_k}(s) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{p_i-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\epsilon_k}(s) \left| b_n^i(t,u-s) \right|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}} ds \right) + 1 \right)$$

$$\le R_2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\epsilon_k}(s)(1 + |u^i - s^i|^{p_i}) ds + 1 \right) \le R_3 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\epsilon_k}(s)(|u^i|^{p_i} + \epsilon_k^{p_i}) ds + 1 \right)$$

$$\le R_4 (1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d} |u^i|^{p_i}),$$

for some constant $R_4 > 0$.

On the other hand,

$$\left(F_n^k(t,u), u \right) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\epsilon_k}(s) (b_n(t,u-s), u-s) ds + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\epsilon_k}(s) \left(b_n(t,u-s), s \right) ds - p\delta_{nk} \sum_{i=1}^{n} u^i$$

$$\ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\epsilon_k}(s) (\gamma \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left| u^i - s^i \right|^{p_i} - D_2) ds - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\epsilon_k}(s) \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left(\frac{\gamma}{2D_1} \left| b_n^i(t,u-s) \right|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}} + R_5 \left| s^i \right|^{p_i} \right) ds$$

$$-p\delta_{nk} \sum_{i=1}^{n} u^i \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\epsilon_k}(s) (\gamma \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left| u^i - s^i \right|^{p_i} - D_2) ds - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\epsilon_k}(s) \left(\frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{d} |u^i - s^i|^{p_i} + R_6 \right) ds$$

$$-p\delta_{nk} \sum_{i=1}^{n} u^i \ge \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_{\epsilon_k}(s) \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left| u^i - s^i \right|^{p_i} ds - R_7 - p\delta_{nk} \sum_{i=1}^{n} u^i \ge \nu \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left| u^i \right|^{p_i} - R_8,$$

for some constants $\nu, R_8 > 0$, where in the last inequality we have used that for some $D > 0$,

$$\left| u^i \right|^{p_i} = \left| u^i - s^i + s^i \right|^{p_i} \le D \left(\left| u^i - s^i \right|^{p_i} + \left| s^i \right|^{p_i} \right) \le D \left(\left| u^i - s^i \right|^{p_i} + \epsilon_k^{p_i} \right).$$

Hence, (47) holds.

In view of Lemmas 17, 18 the functions b_n, h satisfy (37). Hence, $\left| f_n^{ki}(t,u) - b_n^i(t,u) \right| \le \delta_{nk}$, for any i, n and any u satisfying $|u| \le n+2$, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} h^i(t,x) - F_n^{ki}(t,u) &= h^i(t,x) - f_n^{ki}(t,u) + p\delta_{nk} \\ &\ge h^i(t,x) - b_n^i(t,u) \ge 0, \end{aligned}$$

for u such that $u_i = 0$, $u_j \ge 0$, $j \ne i$, and $|u| \le n+2$. ■

Define a smooth function $\phi_n : \mathbb{R}_+ \to [0,1]$ satisfying

$$\phi_n(s) = \begin{cases} 1, \text{ if } 0 \le s \le n+1+\overline{\gamma}, \\ 0 \le \phi_n(s) \le 1, \text{ if } n+1+\overline{\gamma} \le s \le n+2, \\ 0, \text{ if } s \ge n+2, \end{cases}$$

where $0 < \overline{\gamma} < 1$ is fixed. Let $l_n^k(t,u)$ be given by

$$l_n^k(t,u) = \phi_n(|u|) F_n^k(t,u) + (1-\phi_n(|u|)) b_n(t,u).$$

Since for any compact subset $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and any n we have $f_n^k \to b_n$ uniformly on $[\tau, T] \times A$ as $k \to \infty$ it is clear that

$$\sup_{t\in[\tau,T]} \sup_{|u|\le A} |l_n^k(t,u) - b_n(t,u)| \to 0, \text{ } as \ k \to \infty.$$

Lemma 20 *Let f satisfy (4)-(5) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$. For all $n, k \ge 1$ we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^d |l_n^{ki}(t,u)|^{\frac{p_i}{p_i-1}} \le D_5(1+\sum_{i=1}^d |u^i|^{p_i}), \ \left(l_n^k(t,u), u\right) \ge \lambda \sum_{i=1}^d |u^i|^{p_i} - D_6, \tag{48}$$

for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$, where the positive constants D_5, D_6, λ do not depend neither on n nor k. Also,

$$\left(l_{nu}^k(t,u)w, w\right) \ge -D_7(k,n)|w|^2, \ \forall u, w, \tag{49}$$

where $D_7(k,n)$ is a non-negative number.

Moreover, if f, h satisfy (37), then l_n^k, h also satisfies this condition.

Proof. The inequalities given in (48) are an easy consequence of (41), (44) and (47).

On the other hand, if u is such that $u_i = 0$, $u_j \ge 0$, $j \ne i$, then in view of Lemmas 17, 18 and 19 we have

$$\phi_n(|u|)\left(h^i(t,x) - F_n^{ki}(t,u)\right) \ge 0, \ (1-\phi_n(|u|))\left(h^i(t,x) - b_n^i(t,u)\right) \ge 0,$$

as $\phi_n(|u|) = 0$, for $|u| \ge n+2$. Hence, $h^i(t,x) - l_n^{ki}(t,u) \ge 0$, so that condition (37) holds.

It is also clear that $l_n^k(t,u)$ is continuously differentiable with respect to u for any t and u. We obtain the existence of $D_7(k,n)$ such that (49) holds. Indeed, if $|u| \le n+1+\overline{\gamma}$, then $l_n^k(t,u) = F_n^k(t,u)$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \left|(l_{nu}^k(t,u)w,w)\right| &= \left|(F_{nu}^k(t,u)w,w)\right| = \left|(f_{nu}^k(t,u)w,w)\right| \\ &\le |w|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left|\nabla\rho_{\epsilon_k}(u-s)\right| |b_n(s,u)| \, ds \le R_1(k,n)|w|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

If $|u| \geq n+2$, then $l_n^k(t,u) = b_n(t,u)$, so that by (42), (45) we have $(l_{nu}^k(t,u)w,w) = (b_{nu}(t,u)w,w) \geq 0$. Finally, if $n+1+\overline{\gamma} < |u| < n+2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(l_{nu}^k(t,u)w,w) &= \phi_n(|u|)(F_{nu}^k(t,u)w,w) + (1-\phi_n(|u|))(b_{nu}(t,u)w,w) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial u_j}\phi_n(|u|) F_n^{ki}(t,u)w_iw_j - \sum_{i,j=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial u_j}\phi_n(|u|) b_n^i(t,u)w_iw_j \\ &\geq -R_2(k,n)|w|^2,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used similar arguments as in (50), (42), (45) and also that

$$\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial u_j}\phi_n(|u|)\right| \leq R_3(n), \left|b_n^i(t,u)\right| \leq R_4(n), \left|F_n^{ki}(t,u)\right| \leq R_5(k,n),$$

for any u satisfying $n+1+\overline{\gamma} < |u| < n+2$, $t \in [\tau, T]$ and any i,j. ■

Now we are ready to obtain the weak comparison principle for positive solutions.

Theorem 21 *Let f_j, h_j satisfy (36)-(37). Assume that f_j, h_j satisfy (4)-(5) and (11) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$. We suppose that either f_1 or f_2 satisfies (8) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ and for an arbitrary $R_0 > 0$. If $0 \leq u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$, there exist two solutions u_1, u_2 (of (9) and (10), respectively, with $u_1(\tau) = u_\tau^1$, $u_2(\tau) = u_\tau^2$, such that $0 \leq u_1(t) \leq u_2(t)$, for all $t \in [\tau, T]$.*

Proof. For f_j let us consider the approximations $\widetilde{f}_{1n}$, f_{2n} defined before with $q_i = p_i^2 \leq p_i^1$, where the last inequality follows from Lemma 12. Then by Lemmas 17, 18 we have that $\widetilde{f}_{1n}, f_{2n}$ satisfy (4)-(5) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ with constants not depending on n. Also, (42), (45) hold and (37) is satisfied in both cases. Moreover, by (11) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{f}_{1n}^i(t,u) &= \psi_n(|u|) f_1^i(t,u) + (1-\psi_n(|u|))\left(\left|u^i\right|^{p_i^1-1} + \left|u^i\right|^{p_i^2-1} + f_1^i(t,0,...,0)\right) \\ &\geq \psi_n(|u|) f_2^i(t,u) + (1-\psi_n(|u|))\left(\left|u^i\right|^{p_i^2-1} + f_2^i(t,0,...,0)\right) = f_{2n}^i(t,u),\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

if $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$.

As explained before, we can choose a sequence $\delta_{nk} \in (0,1)$ such that $\delta_{nk} \to 0$, as $k \to \infty$, and $\left|f_{1n}^{ki}(t,u) - \widetilde{f}_{1n}^i(t,u)\right| \leq \delta_{nk}$, $\left|f_{2n}^{ki}(t,u) - f_{2n}^i(t,u)\right| \leq \delta_{nk}$, for any i, n and any u satisfying $|u| \leq n+2$. Further, we consider the functions

$$\begin{aligned}F_{1n}^{ki}(t,u) &= f_{1n}^{ki}(t,u) - \delta_{nk}, \\ F_{2n}^{ki}(t,u) &= f_{2n}^{ki}(t,u) - 3\delta_{nk}.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 19 we know that F_{jn}^k satisfy (4)-(5) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_d^+$ with constants not depending neither on k nor n, and condition (37) for $|u| \leq n+2$, as well. Moreover, by (51) we have

$$\begin{aligned}F_{2n}^{ki}(t,u) &= f_{2n}^{ki}(t,u) - 3\delta_{nk} \\ &\leq f_{2n}^i(t,u) - 2\delta_{nk} \leq f_{1n}^i(t,u) - 2\delta_{nk} \\ &\leq f_{1n}^{ki}(t,u) - \delta_{nk} = F_{1n}^{ki}(t,u),\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

if $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ and $|u| \leq n+2$.

Suppose, for example, that f_2 satisfies condition (8) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$. For any $t \in [\tau, T]$ and any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ such that $u^i = v^i$ and $u^j \leq v^j$ if $j \neq i$, $|u|, |v| \leq n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_{2n}^{ki}(t,u) &= f_{2n}^{ki}(t,u) - 3\delta_{nk} \geq f_{2n}(t,u) - 4\delta_{nk} \\ &= f_2^i(t,u) - 4\delta_{nk} \geq f_2^i(t,v) - 4\delta_{nk} \\ &= f_{2n}^i(t,v) - 4\delta_{nk} \geq f_{2n}^{ki}(t,v) - 5\delta_{nk} = F_{2n}^{ki}(t,v) - 2\delta_{nk}. \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Hence, (39) is satisfied with $R_0 = n$ and $\varepsilon = 2\delta_{nk}$.

Now, we will define the functions

$$\begin{aligned} l_{1n}^k(t,u) &= \phi_n(|u|) F_{1n}^k(t,u) + (1 - \phi_n(|u|)) \widetilde{f}_{1n}(t,u), \\ l_{2n}^k(t,u) &= \phi_n(|u|) F_{2n}^k(t,u) + (1 - \phi_n(|u|)) f_{2n}(t,u). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 20 these functions satisfy (4)-(5) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ with constants not depending neither on k nor n, inequality (49), and condition (37).

In view of (51), (52) and $\phi_n(|u|) = 0$, if $|u| \geq n+2$, we obtain

$$\phi_n(|u|) F_{1n}^{ki}(t,u) \geq \phi_n(|u|) F_{2n}^{ki}(t,u), \ (1 - \phi_n(|u|)) \widetilde{f}_{1n}^i(t,u) \geq (1 - \phi_n(|u|)) f_{2n}^i(t,u)$$

and then if $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$,

$$l_{1n}^k(t,u) \geq l_{2n}^k(t,u). \tag{54}$$

On the other hand, since $l_{2n}^k(t,u) = F_{2n}^k(t,u)$ if $|u| \leq n + 1 + \overline{\gamma}$, (53) implies

$$l_{2n}^k(t,u) \geq l_{2n}^k(t,v) - 2\delta_{nk}, \tag{55}$$

for any $t \in [\tau, T]$ and any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ such that $u^i = v^i$ and $u^j \leq v^j$ if $j \neq i$, $|u|, |v| \leq n$. Thus, (39) is satisfied with $R_0 = n$ and $\varepsilon = 2\delta_{nk}$.

We consider now the problems

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - a\Delta u + l_{jn}^k(t,u) = h_j(t,x), \quad (t,x) \in (\tau, T) \times \Omega, \\ u|_{x \in \partial\Omega} = 0, \\ u|_{t=\tau} = u_\tau, \end{cases} \tag{56}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - a\Delta u + b_{jn}(t,u) = h_j(t,x), \quad (t,x) \in (\tau, T) \times \Omega, \\ u|_{x \in \partial\Omega} = 0, \\ u|_{t=\tau} = u_\tau, \end{cases} \tag{57}$$

where $b_{1n} = \widetilde{f}_{1n}$ and $b_{2n} = f_{2n}$.

In view of Lemma 20 and [12, Lemma 5] problem (56) has a unique weak solution $u_n^k(\cdot)$ such that $u_n^k(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in [\tau, T]$. Let $u_{jn}^k(\cdot)$ be the solutions of (56) corresponding to the initial data u_τ^j, where $j = 1, 2$. Using Lemma 20 it is standard to obtain estimate (13) with a constant D not depending neither on n nor k. Then the solutions $u_{jn}^k(\cdot)$ of (56) satisfy

$$\left\|u_{jn}^k(t)\right\|^2 \leq \|u_\tau^j\|^2 + D\int_\tau^T (\|h_j(r)\|^2 + 1)dr = K^2\left(\|u_\tau^j\|, \tau, T\right).$$

Thus, since l_{2n}^k satisfy condition (39) with $R_0^2 = n^2 \geq 2\max\{K^2(\|u_\tau^1\|, \tau, T), K^2(\|u_\tau^2\|, \tau, T)\}$, by Theorem 16 we know that as $u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$, we have

$$\left\|\left(u_{1n}^k(t) - u_{2n}^k(t)\right)^+\right\| \leq 2C(\tau, T)\,\delta_{nk}, \tag{58}$$

for all $t \in [\tau, T]$, all k and $n \geq (2\max\{K^2(\|u_\tau^1\|, \tau, T), K^2(\|u_\tau^2\|, \tau, T)\})^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 7 we obtain that for $j = 1, 2$ the sequence u_{jn}^k converges (up to a subsequence) in the sense of (22)-(29) to a solution u_{jn} of problem (57) with initial data u_τ^j. In particular, as $k \to \infty$ we have

$$u_{jn}^k(t) \to u_{jn}(t) \text{ in } H \text{ for all } t \in [\tau, T]. \tag{59}$$

Fix $n \geq (2\max\{K^2(\|u_\tau^1\|, \tau, T), K^2(\|u_\tau^2\|, \tau, T)\})^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $i \in \{1, ..., d\}$ and take any $t \in [\tau, T]$. Denote by Ω_{nk}^{it} the set

$$\Omega_{nk}^{it} = \{x \in \Omega : u_{1n}^{ki}(t, x) - u_{2n}^{ki}(t, x) \geq 0\}.$$

By (58) as $k \to \infty$ we have

$$\int_{\Omega_{nk}^t} \left(u_{1n}^{ki}(t, x) - u_{2n}^{ki}(t, x)\right)^2 dx = \int_\Omega \left(\left(u_{1n}^{ki}(t) - u_{2n}^{ki}(t)\right)^+\right)^2 dx \leq 4C^2(\tau, T)\,\delta_{nk}^2 \to 0. \tag{60}$$

Hence, (59) implies

$$\int_{\Omega\backslash\Omega_{nk}^t} \left(u_{1n}^{ki}(t, x) - u_{2n}^{ki}(t, x)\right)^2 dx \to \int_\Omega \left(u_{1n}^i(t, x) - u_{2n}^i(t, x)\right)^2 dx \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$

Define the sequence

$$w_n^{ki}(t, x) = \begin{cases} u_{1n}^{ki}(t, x) - u_{2n}^{ki}(t, x), \text{ if } x \in \Omega\backslash\Omega_{nk}^{it}, \\ 0, \text{ if } x \in \Omega_{nk}^{it}. \end{cases}$$

Then it is clear that $\left\|w_n^{ki}(t)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \to \left\|u_{1n}^{ki}(t) - u_{2n}^{ki}(t)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ as $k \to \infty$. We note also that $w_n^{ki}(t) \to u_{1n}^i(t) - u_{2n}^i(t)$ weakly in $L^2(\Omega)$, as for any $\xi \in L^2(\Omega)$, (60) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Omega w_n^{ki}(t, x)\,\xi(x)\,dx \\ &= \int_\Omega \left(u_{1n}^{ki}(t, x) - u_{2n}^{ki}(t, x)\right)\xi(x)\,dx - \int_{\Omega_{nk}^t} \left(u_{1n}^{ki}(t, x) - u_{2n}^{ki}(t, x)\right)\xi(x)\,dx \to 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $w_n^{ki}(t) \to u_{1n}^i(t) - u_{2n}^i(t)$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ so that $w_n^{ki}(t,x) \to u_{1n}^i(t,x) - u_{2n}^i(t,x)$ for a.a. $x \in \Omega$. Since $w_n^{ki}(t,x) \leq 0$, for a.a. Ω, we obtain

$$0 \leq u_{1n}(t) \leq u_{2n}(t) \text{ for all } t \in [\tau, T].$$

Arguing again as in the proof of Theorem 8 we obtain that the sequences u_{1n}, u_{2n} converge (up to a subsequence) in the sense of (22)-(29) to the solutions u_1, u_2 of problem (9) and (10), respectively. Also, it holds

$$0 \leq u_1(t) \leq u_2(t), \text{ for all } t \in [\tau, T].$$

■

As in the previous section we shall generalize this theorem to the case where the constant α can be negative. We note that if f_j, h_j satisfy (37), then $\widetilde{f}_j(t,v) = e^{-\beta t} f_j(t, e^{\beta t} v) + \beta v$, $\widetilde{h}_j = e^{-\beta t} h_j$ also satisfy (37). Arguing as in Theorem 9 we obtain the following.

Theorem 22 *Let f_j, h_j satisfy (36)-(37). Assume that f_j, h_j satisfy (30)-(31) and (11) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$. Also, suppose that either f_1 or f_2 satisfies (8) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ for an arbitrary $R_0 > 0$. If $u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$, there exist two solutions u_1, u_2 (of (9) and (10), respectively), with $u_1(\tau) = u_\tau^1$, $u_2(\tau) = u_\tau^2$, such that $0 \leq u_1(t) \leq u_2(t)$, for all $t \in [\tau, T]$.*

But in this case we can consider another interesting situation, as the values p_i^1 and p_i^2 are not necessarily equal.

Let f_1 satisfy (4)-(5) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$, whereas f_2 satisfy (30)-(31) for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$, with constants α^j, C_1^j, C_2^j, $j = 1, 2$. Then if $\alpha^2 < 0$, we make in (3) the change of variable $v = e^{-\beta t} u$, where $\beta > -\alpha^2$. We obtain problems (32)-(33).

If $v(t)$ is a weak solution of (32), then $u(t) = e^{\beta t} v(t)$ is a weak solution of (9) (and the same is true, of course, for (33) and (10)).

The function $\widetilde{f}_1(t,v) = e^{-\beta t} f_1(t, e^{\beta t} v) + \beta v$ satisfies (4)-(5) for $v \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ with the same p_i^1 as f_1. Indeed, as $e^{\beta t \left(p_i^1 - 2\right)} \geq 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left| \widetilde{f}_1^i(t,v) \right|^{\frac{p_i^1}{p_i^1 - 1}} &\leq K_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} \left| f_1^i(t, e^{\beta t} v) \right|^{\frac{p_i^1}{p_i^1 - 1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left| v^i \right|^{\frac{p_i^1}{p_i^1 - 1}} \right) \\ &\leq K_2 \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left| v^i \right|^{p_i^1} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

$$\left(\widetilde{f}_1(t,v), v \right) \geq e^{-2\beta t} \left(\alpha^1 \sum_{i=1}^{d} e^{\beta t p_i} \left| v^i \right|^{p_i^1} - C_2^1 \right) + \beta \left| v \right|^2 \geq \alpha^1 \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left| v^i \right|^{p_i^1} - \widetilde{C}_2^1. \tag{62}$$

Then we obtain the following.

Theorem 23 *Let* f_j, h_j *satisfy (36)-(37). Let* f_1 *satisfy (4)-(5) for* $u \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$*, whereas* f_2 *satisfy (30)-(31) for* $u \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$*, with constants* α^j, C_1^j, C_2^j*,* $j = 1, 2$*. Assume that* f_j, h_j *satisfy (11). Also, suppose that either* f_1 *or* f_2 *satisfies (8) for* $u \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$ *for an arbitrary* $R_0 > 0$*. If* $u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$*, there exist two solutions* u_1, u_2 *(of (9) and (10), respectively), with* $u_1(\tau) = u_\tau^1$*,* $u_2(\tau) = u_\tau^2$*, such that* $0 \leq u_1(t) \leq u_2(t)$*, for all* $t \in [\tau, T]$*.*

Proof. We consider problems (32) and (33). In view of (34)-(35) and (61)-(62), $\widetilde{f_2}(t, v) = e^{-\beta t} f_j(t, e^{\beta t} v) + \beta v$ satisfy (4)-(5) for $v \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$ with $p_i^2 = 2$, and $\widetilde{f_1}$ satisfies (4)-(5) for $v \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$ with the same p_i^1 as f_1. Also, defining $\widetilde{h_j}(t, x) = e^{-\beta t} h_j(t, x)$ it is clear that (11) and (37) hold. Finally, if, for example, f_1 satisfies (8) for $u \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$ for any $R_0 > 0$, then it is obvious that for $\widetilde{f_1}$ is true as well.

Hence, by Theorem 21 there exist two solutions v_1, v_2 (of (32) and (33), respectively), with $v_j(\tau) = e^{-\beta\tau} u_\tau^j$, such that $0 \leq v_1(t) \leq v_2(t)$, for all $t \in [\tau, T]$. Thus

$$0 \leq u_1(t) = e^{\beta t} v_1(t) \leq e^{\beta t} v_2(t) = u_2(t), \text{ for } t \in [\tau, T],$$

and u_1, u_2 are solutions (of (9) and (10), respectively, such that $u_j(\tau) = u_\tau^j$. ■

Remark 24 *If* f_j *satisfy (7), then the solutions* u_1, u_2 *given in Theorems 22, 23 are unique for the corresponding initial data.*

Remark 25 *All the result proved so far are true if insead of Dirichlet boundary conditions we consider Neumann boundary conditions*

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ in } \partial\Omega,$$

where ν *is the unit outward normal. In such a case the space* V *will be* $\left(H^1(\Omega)\right)^d$*. The proofs remain the same.*

4 Applications

We shall apply now the previous results to some model of physical and biological interest.

4.1 The Lotka-Volterra system

We also study the Lotka-Volterra system with diffusion

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u^1}{\partial t} = D_1 \Delta u^1 + u^1 \left(a_1(t) - u^1 - a_{12}(t) u^2 - a_{13}(t) u^3\right), \\ \dfrac{\partial u^2}{\partial t} = D_2 \Delta u^2 + u^2 \left(a_2(t) - u^2 - a_{21}(t) u^1 - a_{23}(t) u^3\right), \\ \dfrac{\partial u^3}{\partial t} = D_3 \Delta u^3 + u^3 \left(a_3(t) - u^3 - a_{31}(t) u^1 - a_{32}(t) u^2\right), \end{cases} \tag{63}$$

with either Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions, where $u^i = u^i(x,t) \geq 0$ and the functions $a_i(t), a_{ij}(t)$ are positive and continuous. Also, D_i are positive constants and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. The initial data u_τ belongs to $\left(L^2(\Omega)\right)^3$.

In this case the functions f_1, h_1 are given by

$$f_1(t,u) = \begin{pmatrix} -u^1\left(a_1(t) - u^1 - a_{12}(t)u^2 - a_{13}(t)u^3\right) \\ -u^2\left(a_2(t) - u^2 - a_{21}(t)u^1 - a_{23}(t)u^3\right) \\ -u^3\left(a_3(t) - u^3 - a_{31}(t)u^1 - a_{32}(t)u^2\right) \end{pmatrix},\ h_1(t) \equiv 0.$$

Uniqueness of the Cauchy problem for this system has been proved only if we consider solutions confined in an invariant region (for example, in a parallelepiped $\mathcal{D} = \{(u^1,u^2,u^3) : 0 \leq u^i \leq k^i\}$ when the parameters do not depend on t) (see [15] and [22]). However, in the general case for initial data just in $\left(L^2(\Omega)\right)^3$ it is an open problem so far.

System (63) satisfies conditions (4)-(5) with $p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = 3$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}^3_+$ [12, p.263]. Also, it is clear that (36)-(37) hold.

We shall compare with the following system

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u^1}{\partial t} = D_1\Delta u^1 + u^1\left(a_1(t) - u^1\right), \\ \dfrac{\partial u^2}{\partial t} = D_2\Delta u^2 + u^2\left(a_2(t) - u^2\right), \\ \dfrac{\partial u^3}{\partial t} = D_3\Delta u^3 + u^3\left(a_3(t) - u^3\right), \end{cases} \tag{64}$$

which is a system of three uncoupled logitic equations. The functions f_2, h_2 are given by

$$f_2(t,u) = \begin{pmatrix} -u^1\left(a_1(t) - u^1\right) \\ -u^2\left(a_2(t) - u^2\right) \\ -u^3\left(a_3(t) - u^3\right) \end{pmatrix},\ h_2(t) \equiv 0.$$

It is easy to see that system (64) satisfies conditions (4)-(5) with $p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = 3$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Also, it is clear that (36)-(37) hold, and that condition (8) is trivially satisifed. Moreover,

$$f_1^i(t,u) \geq f_2^i(t,u),$$

for all t, $u \in \mathbb{R}^3_+$ and i, so that (11) holds for $u \in \mathbb{R}^3_+$.

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(f_{2u}(t,u)w, w) \geq & -a_1(t)w_1^2 - a_2(t)w_2^2 - a_3(t)w_3^2 \\ & +2\left(u^1w_1^2 + u^2w_2^2 + u^3w_3^2\right) \geq -C|w|^2,\end{aligned}$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^3_+$, $t \in [\tau, T]$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^3$, where $C > 0$.

Thus, by Theorem 21, Lemma 11 and Remark 25 we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 26 *If* $0 \leq u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$, *there exist a solution* u_1 *of (63) with* $u_1(\tau) = u_\tau^1$ *such that* $0 \leq u_1(t) \leq u_2(t)$, *for all* $t \in [\tau, T]$, *where* u_2 *is the unique solution with* $u_2(\tau) = u_\tau^2$ *of (64) in the class of solutions satisfying* $u_2(t) \geq 0$ *for all* t.

This theorem says that there exists at least one solution of the Lotka-Volterra system which is dominated by the unique non-negative solution of the uncoupled logistic system (64).

Further, we shall compare with the uncoupled linear system

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u^1}{\partial t} = D_1 \Delta u^1 + u^1 a_1(t), \\ \dfrac{\partial u^2}{\partial t} = D_2 \Delta u^2 + u^2 a_2(t), \\ \dfrac{\partial u^3}{\partial t} = D_3 \Delta u^3 + u^3 a_3(t). \end{cases} \tag{65}$$

Hence,

$$f_2(t,u) = \begin{pmatrix} -u^1 a_1(t) \\ -u^2 a_2(t) \\ -u^3 a_3(t) \end{pmatrix}, \ h_2(t) \equiv 0.$$

Obviously system (65) satisfies conditions (30)-(31) for $u \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Also, it is clear that (36)-(37) and condition (8) are trivially satisifed. Moreover,

$$f_1^i(t,u) \geq f_2^i(t,u),$$

for all t, $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^3$ and i, so that (11) holds for $u \in \mathbb{R}_+^3$. Also, we have

$$(f_{2u}(t,u) w, w) \geq -a_1(t) w_1^2 - a_2(t) w_2^2 - a_3(t) w_3^2 \geq -C |w|^2,$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $t \in [\tau, T]$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^3$, where $C > 0$.

Thus, by Theorem 23 and Remark 25 we have the following.

Theorem 27 *If* $0 \leq u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$, *there exist a solution* u_1 *of (63) with* $u_1(\tau) = u_\tau^1$ *such that* $0 \leq u_1(t) \leq u_2(t)$, *for all* $t \in [\tau, T]$, *where* u_2 *is the unique solution of (65) with* $u_2(\tau) = u_\tau^2$.

Let us consider now the autonomous case, that is, $a_i(t) \equiv a_i > 0$ and $\tau = 0$, with Diriclet boundary conditions.

By the changes of variable $v^i(t) = e^{-a_i t} u^i(t)$ system (65) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial v^i}{\partial t} = D_i \Delta v^i, \ i = 1, 2, 3, \\ \quad v^i|_{x \in \partial \Omega} = 0, \end{cases} \tag{66}$$

with initial data $v_0 = u_0$.

The operator $A = -D_i\Delta$ in the space $L^2(\Omega)$ with domain $D(A) = H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ is sectorial [9]. Moreover, since the eigenvalues of A are $0 < D_i\lambda_1 \leq D_i\lambda_2 \leq \ldots$, we have that the minimum eigenvalue is strictly greater than 0. Denote by e^{-At} the analytic semigroup generated by the operator A. Then $v(t) = e^{-At}v_0$ is the unique solution of (66) with $v(0) = v_0$.

It is well known [9] that the operator A generate a scale of interpolation spaces $X^\alpha = D(A^\alpha)$ with the norm $\|v\|_\alpha = \|A^\alpha v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, $\alpha \geq 0$, where $X^\alpha \subset H^{2\alpha}(\Omega)$ with continuous embedding. Take $0 < \delta < D_1\lambda_1$. Then by Theorem 1.4.3 in [9] we obtain

$$\left\|A^\alpha e^{-At}v_0^i\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_\alpha t^{-\alpha} e^{-\delta t}\left\|v_0^i\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ for } t > 0.$$

Since this is true for every $\delta < D_i\lambda_1$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|A^\alpha e^{-At}v_0^i\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq C_\alpha t^{-\alpha} e^{-D_i\lambda_1 t}\left\|v_0^i\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)},\\ \left\|e^{-At}v_0^i\right\|_{H^{2\alpha}(\Omega)} &\leq \widetilde{C}_\alpha t^{-\alpha} e^{-D_i\lambda_1 t}\left\|v_0^i\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ for } t > 0.\end{aligned}$$

We note that $H^{2\alpha}(\Omega) \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$ with continuous embedding if $\alpha > \frac{3}{4}$. Since the constants C_α are bounded for α in compact sets, we obtain the existence of C such that

$$\left\|e^{-At}v_0^i\right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq Ct^{-\frac{3}{4}} e^{-D\lambda_1 t}\left\|v_0^i\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ for } t > 0,$$

where $D = \min\{D_1, D_2, D_3\}$. Then the unique solution of (65) with $u(0) = u_0$ satisfies

$$\|u(t)\|_{(L^\infty(\Omega))^3} \leq Ct^{-\frac{3}{4}} e^{(a-D\lambda_1)t}\|u_0\| \text{ for } t > 0, \tag{67}$$

where $a = \max\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$.

Joining (67) and Theorem 27 we obtain the following result.

Theorem 28 *There exist at least one solution $u(t)$ of the autonomous system (63) with $u(0) = u_0$ and Dirichlet boundary conditions such that*

$$\|u(t)\|_{(L^\infty(\Omega))^3} \leq Ct^{-\frac{3}{4}} e^{(a-D\lambda_1)t}\|u_0\| \text{ for } t \in (0, T],$$

where $C > 0$ and $D = \min\{D_1, D_2, D_3\}$, $a = \max\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$.

We shall obtain also a weak maximum principle for the autonomous Lotka-Volterra system with Dirichlet boundary conditions.

By the maximum principle for the heat equation it is well known (see [4]) that for any $t \geq 0$ the unique solution of equation (66) satisfies

$$0 \leq v^i(t, x) \leq \sup_\Omega v_0^i \text{ for a.a. } x \in \Omega.$$

Hence, the unique solution of equation (65) satisfies

$$0 \leq u^i(t, x) \leq e^{a_i t}\sup_\Omega v_0^i \text{ for a.a. } x \in \Omega. \tag{68}$$

By (68) and Theorem 27 we obtain the following weak maximum principle.

Theorem 29 *There exist at least one solution* $u(t)$ *of the autonomous system (63) with* $u(0) = u_0$ *and Dirichlet boundary conditions such that for any* $t \in [0, T]$,

$$0 \le u^i(t, x) \le e^{a_i t} \sup_{\Omega} u_0^i \text{ for a.a. } x \in \Omega,\ i = 1, 2, 3.$$

In particular, if $u_0 \in (L^\infty(\Omega))^3$, *then*

$$\|u(t)\|_{(L^\infty(\Omega))^3} \le e^{at} \|u_0\|_{(L^\infty(\Omega))^3} \text{ for } t \in [0, T],$$

where $a = \max\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$.

4.2 A model of fractional-order chemical autocatalysis with decay

Consider the following scalar problem

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \dfrac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + (1-u)\, u^m - k u^r, \\ \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial x}(0,t) = \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial x}(a,t) = 0, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0(x), \end{cases} \tag{69}$$

where $u \ge 0$, $N = 1$, $d = 1$, $\Omega = (0, L)$, and $k > 0$, $0 < m, r < 1$. The initial data u_0 belongs to $L^2(0, a)$. This equation models an isothermal chemical autocatalysis (see [16]). In [16] the authors study the travelling waves of the equation in the case where $\Omega = (0, +\infty)$ with Neumann boundary conditions at $x = 0$. The variable u is non-negative, since it represents a chemical concentration.

The funtions f, h are given by $f(u) = (u-1)\, u^m + k u^r$, $h \equiv 0$. Clearly, conditions (4)-(5) hold (with $p = m + 2$) for $u \ge 0$. In this case (36)-(37) and (8) are trivially satisifed.

We take $f_1 = f_2 = f$, and applying Theorem 21 and Remark 25 obtain the following.

Theorem 30 *If* $0 \le u_\tau^1 \le u_\tau^2$, *there exist solutions* u_1, u_2 *of (69) with* $u_1(0) = u_0^1$, $u_2(0) = u_0^2$ *such that* $0 \le u_1(t) \le u_2(t)$, *for all* $t \in [0, T]$.

4.3 A generalized logistic equation

Consider the following scalar problem

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \dfrac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + (1-u^q)\, u^r, \\ \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial x}(0,t) = \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial x}(a,t) = 0, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0(x), \end{cases} \tag{70}$$

where $u \geq 0$, $N = 1$, $\Omega = (0, L)$, $r, q > 0$ and $r + q \geq 1$. The initial data u_0 belongs to $L^2(0, a)$.

This kind of nonlinearities for the logistic equation (instead of the classical $(1 - u)u$) has been considered in [18, Chapter 11].

The funtions f, h are given by $f(u) = (u^q - 1)u^r$, $h \equiv 0$. Clearly, conditions (4)-(5) hold (with $p = r + q + 1$) for $u \geq 0$. In this case (36)-(37) and (8) are trivially satisifed.

We take $f_1 = f_2 = f$, and applying Theorem 21 and Remark 25 obtain the following.

Theorem 31 *If* $0 \leq u_\tau^1 \leq u_\tau^2$*, there exist two solution* u_1, u_2 *of (70) with* $u_1(0) = u_0^1$*,* $u_2(0) = u_0^2$ *such that* $0 \leq u_1(t) \leq u_2(t)$*, for all* $t \in [0, T]$*.*

Acknowledgments.

This work was been partially supported by the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, Projects MTM2008-00088 and MTM2009-11820, by the Consejería de Innovación, Ciencia y Empresa (Junta de Andalucía), grant P07-FQM-02468, and by the Consejería de Cultura y Educación (Comunidad Autónoma de Murcia), grant 08667/PI/08.

References

[1] L.Arnold, I. Chueshov, Order-preserving random dynamical systems: equilibria, attractors, equilibria, *Dynamics and Stability of Systems,* **14** (1998), 265-272.

[2] L.Arnold, I.Chueshov, A limit set trichotomy for order-preserving random systems, *Positivity* **5** (2001), 95-114.

[3] Arrieta J.M., Rodríguez-Bernal A. and Vidal-López A., Regiones atractoras delimitadas por puntos de equilibrio extremales para ecuaciones de reacción-difusión, Proceedings in CDRom of the XVIII CEDYA-VIII CMA, Tarragona (Spain), 2003.

[4] H. Brezis, "Análisis Funcional", Alianza Editorial, Madrid, 1984 (Translated from "Analyse Fonctionalle", Masson, Paris, 1983).

[5] T. Caraballo, J.A. Langa, J.Valero, Asymptotic behaviour of monotone multi-valued dynamical systems, *Dynam. Syst.*, **20** (2005), 301-321.

[6] A.N. Carvalho, C.B. Gentile, Comparison results for nonlinear parabolic equations with monotone principal part, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **259** (2001), 319-337.

[7] V.V. Chepyzhov and M.I.Vishik, "Attractors for equations of mathematical physics", American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 2002.

[8] I.D. Chueshov, "Monotone random systems: theory and applications", Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1779, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002.

[9] D. Henry, "Geometric theory of semilinear parabolic equations", Springer, Berlin, 1981.

[10] U. Krause, P. Ranft, A limit set trichotomy for monotone nonlinear dynamical systems, *Nonlinear Analysis*, **19 (**1992), 375-392.

[11] A.V. Kapustyan, J. Valero, A.V. Kapustyan and J. Valero, On the connectedness and asymptotic behaviour of solutions of reaction-diffusion systems, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **323** (2006), 614-633.

[12] A.V. Kapustyan, J. Valero, A.V. Kapustyan, J. Valero, On the Kneser property for the complex Ginzburg-Landau equation and the Lotka-Volterra system with diffusion, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **357 (**2009), 254-272.

[13] P. Kotelenez, Comparison methods for a class of fucntion valued stochastic partial differential equations, *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, **93** (1992), 1-19.

[14] J.L. Lions, "Quelques Méthodes de Résolution des Problèmes aux Limites non Linéares", Dunod, Gauthier Villars, 1969.

[15] M. Marion, Attractors for reaction-diffusion equations: existence and estimate of their dimension, *Appl. Anal.,* **25** (1987), 101-147.

[16] P.M. McCabe, J.A. Lerach, D.J. Needham, On an initial boundary-value problem for a coupled, singular reaction-diffusion system arising from a model of fractional-order chemical autocatalysis with decay, *Q. J. Mech. Appl. Math.*, **55** (2002), p.511-560.

[17] F. Morillas, J. Valero, On the Kneser property for reaction-diffusion systems on unbounded domains, *Topol.Appl.*, **156** (2009), 3029–3040.

[18] J.D. Murray, "Mathematical biology", Springer, Berlin, 1993.

[19] J. Robinson, A. Rodríguez-Bernal, A. Vidal-López, Pullback attractors and extremal complete trajectories for non-autonomous reaction–diffusion problems, *J. Differential Equations,* **238** (2007), 289–337.

[20] A. Rodríguez-Bernal, A. Vidal-López, Extremal equilibria for reaction–diffusion equations in bounded domains and applications, *J. Differential Equations*, **244** (2008), 2983-3030.

[21] H.L. Smith, "Monotone dynamical systems. An introduction to the theory of competitive and cooperative systems", Mathematical Surveys and Monographs 41, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995.

[22] J. Smoller, Shock waves and reaction-diffusion equations, Springer, New-York, 1983.